

A

(16)

W O R D

T O

Dr. VVomocke.

O R,

A short Reply to his pretended Resolution
of Mr. Croftons Position, concerning Mini-
sters Use of an *Imposed Liturgie.*

To which is annexed,

A Blow at *ferubbaal Redivivus*:

Discovering his *Weakness* and *Errours* in Defence
of his *Groundless Seceſſion* from Solemn Publick Wor-
ship Miniſtred by the *Engliſh Liturgie.*

By R. S.

The Publisher of *Reformation not Separation.*



London, Printed in the Year 1663.

The Epistle to the Reader.

Courteous Reader,

I Once more trouble thee, and the world, with a few Lines on this unpleasing Subject; I would intreat thy pains to read them. Though many sleight this controversie, it's of weight: Many minister not by the Liturgie; they must be justified, or condemned; publick Worship is confined to Liturgical ministrations; it must be attended, or avoided; and Conscience must direct which is to be done. Mr. Crofton hath (before, and since his imprisonment, in zeal and faithfulness) pointed out the medium between finfull ministrations, and groundless non-communion; in both which, he is opposed by enemies, calumniated by the wicked, and censured by the weak, yea, by Brethren in the Ministry, who have never vouchsafed to read what he hath written, nor have once reproved in him any error. The advantage and increase of Separation is so visible, that I may well stir up zeal to rebuke and repel it; I have therefore once and again appeared its Antagonist: The Blow I now strike is indeed below me; the Assault against my last is very weak. I have written, and pray thee to read, that thou mayest not be deceived with great words, which signifie nothing; and serve to no end, save to fit the weak and simple to speak evil of the things they do not understand. That thou mightest do in judgment and conscience, what thou art like to be compelled to do by force and fear, hath been, and yet is the Endeavour and Prayer of

Thine, seeking purity of Worship,
in union with the Church, whilest

R. S.

Word to Dr. W O M O C K E,

By way of Reply to his pretended Resolve of *Mr. Crofton's* Position concerning Liturgies: And a Blow at *Jerubbaal Redivivus*.

SINCE my publication of *Jerubbaal justified*, there hath appear- Lawrence
ed against it, and me, and Mr. *Crofton* concerned in it, a dou- Womocke,
ble assault, by two different Antagonists, as directly contrary Archdea-
each to other, as the Right and Left Wing; onely combined con of Suf-
in one *Battalia* under the Prince of Darkness, to darken, and, if pos- folk.
sible, destroy the truth; so that as *Luther* between *Rope* and *Ana-* D. Author
baptist, stands Mr. *Crofton* between a Prelatical Clergie and *Separa-* of Jerub-
tists: yet, *vincet veritas*. baal.

Such is the unspeakable weakness of both these mens batteries, that I have passed them with scorn, and stood still, in expectation of the on-set of their main *Battalia*, on the one side, or on the other; but none appearing, I thought good to check their insultation (with which I hear they are puffed up) by these few Lines. And first, to begin with the Learned Doctor, I would crave leave to tell him, if he will give good assurance, that he will in the Schools of the University give Mr. *Crofton* (*viva voce*) the Answer published in his name; I will be bound Mr. *Crofton* shall meet him to receive it; and if the Boys do not hiss the Doctor, he shall go out Victor: Shall I presume to take a turn with this reverend Arch-deacon? I must then tell him;

If he did not mistake, his Printer hath wronged him at the en- Antidote,
trance of his undertaking, to make him read *Non-conformist* instead P 106.
of *Non-conformist*. P. ibid.

That *Pride*, and over weening conceit of our own worth, maketh men *Non-conformists*, I deny; for it is *humility*, and the fear of the Lord: they dare not deviate from Divine Directions; and your instance is an evidence of the same; whilst Mr. *Crofton* doth humbly consult, whether his *conformity* may consist with his *Ministerial Office*; and modestly offer his Notions to Argumentation; the one sheweth his fear of *Sin*, whilst the other sheweth his willingness to be convinced, and both his *humility*.

His Position you have truly transcribed, and observed the state thereof; but if to affirm, *It cannot be denied to be a most base and slavish servility to prostitute the Office to which we are apted and ordained by the Lord Jesus Christ, unto the pleasure and prescriptions of men, though the best for Quality and Authority, be to be proud, I will be proud, and glory in my pride:* And I doubt not, if you were considered as a man who should deny this Position, you, Sir, would be found proud enough to declare your displeasure, as unjustly reproached: I therefore soberly require you, to deny it, if you can, or dare; and if you cannot, what meaneth this digressive flourish?

Your flourish hath indeed given you the start, so that you have lost your question, and fall on a *Magisterial Swada* of Mr. Crostons conformity: Which of Mr. Crostons Syllogisms do you hereby shake? 'Is not this fair disputing? But we will weigh your Reason. You say, *Mr. Crostons may please to be so humble, as to condescend to such an Imposition for peace and order sake.*

How! condescend to such an Imposition which prostitueth the Office received from Christ to the pleasure of men? Can you desire it? Were you in earnest when you wrote this? Can you judge it an act of Humility, or not rather the greatest Arrogancy, for Mr. Crostons, instead of *Minister of Jesus Christ*, to write a *Minister of men*? You need good Arguments; for you say you will prove it, and that by this Argument.

What I may lawfully be determined to by my own private judgment, that I may lawfully be determined to by the judgment of Superiors: But, to stated Forms for the celebration of Gods publick Worship, composed (and for the very words, terms, and expressions) digested into method, I may be lawfully determined by my own private judgment. Ergo, To stated Forms for celebration of Gods solemn publick Worship, composed, and for the very words, terms, and expressions, digested into method, I may lawfully be determined by the judgment of my Superiors.

But how now, Mr. Doctor? what is become of your Question? Do you not use to bring that into your Conclusion? That Mr. Crostons ought to condescend to such an imposition which prostitueth the Office received from Christ to the pleasure of men, was that you pretended to prove; doth not your Syllogism want a foot more to make it reach? But to play with the Prevaricator, know, Sir, I deny both the Propositions of your well-formed Syllogism.

The Major you expect to be denied, and therefore enforce; but I also deny your Minor Proposition (*viz.*) *That to stated Forms for celebration of Gods solemn publick worship, composed (and for the very words, terms, and expressions) digested into method, I may lawfully be determined by mine own private judgment.* For, although Mr. Crofton doth not exclude his own judgment, when he pleads for the liberty of his own invention, to compose and modifie his Forms of publick worship; yet he denieth his judgment a power to determine a stated form, *semper eadem*, always the same, for words, terms, and expressions, what ever be the variations of Gods providence, and the Churches condition. Nor doth this any way follow on the use of his judgment in managing his liberty: That a man may judge a Crutch fit for his now condition, will not conclude, that he may *sana mente* confine himself to a Crutch, one and the same Crutch, at all times, in all conditions; this Argumentation is a manifest halting before a Creeple: In the last, the judgment must needs be erroneous, to be corrected before it be obeyed.

The Major you expecting to be denied, do thus enforce.

What I may lawfully be determined to by a weaker judgment, to that

I may be lawfully determined by a judgment that is stronger.

But, *To stated Forms, &c. I may lawfully be determined by a weaker judgment, (viz.) mine own;*

Ergo, *To stated Forms, &c. I may lawfully be determined by a judgment that was stronger, (viz.) my Superiors.*

Here, Sir, to make the Auditors laugh, I will again become ridiculous, in your fancie, and deny both your Propositions.

I deny the Major in the sequel, *I may be determined by the weaker judgment; and it will not thence follow, that I must therefore be determined by the stronger judgment:* For Sir, the weaker judgment is mine own judgment; and mine own eye is the best guide of mine own steps, though I see but darkly; mine own understanding is my candle from the Lord; my dim light *judicium rationale*, shineth brighter in the closet of mine own breast, than 400. candles, or the *forense judicium* of a Convocation. Sir, the Learned Davenant hath taught me, Men may guide us *Judicio Ministeriali*; but every one must judge *ἰσῳτικῶς & ἀποκριτικῶς*, *Judicio privato*, & *practica discretionis*: Yea, as if to your question, he hath concluded, *Adnundam prescriptionem, aut determinationem alterius, sine lumine privati judicii, nemo est qui credere potest, etiamsi cupiat maxime.* And, Sir, I am not bound to impossibilities; laugh while you list, I will

move by mine own eye, be it never so weak, and my Superiors never so strong; though my dim light seeth not more, it seeth more truly and more directly then their brighter.

But, Sir, that you may know a *man of intolerable pride*, in your account, I deny your *Minor*; and tell you in general, That *the private judgment of a single person may be stronger then the judgment of a Convocation, or whole Council*. Have you never read of one *Gama-liel* in the *Convocation* of the *Scribes and Pharisees*? Or of one *Cranmer* in the *Six Articles Council* of King *Henry the Eighth*? Or of one *Paphbinnusius* in the *Council of Nice*? If not, give us leave to tell you, we hope you will not from *Archdeacon* rise to be *Archbishop*; which if you should, we should fear to be forced to pluck out our eyes, because you say they are weaker then yours, now you are set above us. Let, Sir, *Junior Sophs* judge, whether you have not disputed like the *Master* of much Reason. But, Sir, your *Magisterial Swada* vanished, you appear as a *Respondent*, and say you lay the *Axe* to the *Root* of the *Tree*; and I will give you your due; you do strike at the *Principle* which is the *Radix* of *Mr. Croftons* Argumentation; But, Sir, you seem no skilfull *Carpenter*; you strike a blow which can never reach the *Root*, or once shake the *Tree*.

Mr. Crofton argues, *Ministerial modification of publick Worship by personal abilities, is the formal act of the Ministerial Office*; and he puts his *Respondent* to assign any other: You most profoundly answer by denial, and then assign *Ministration to be the formal act of the Ministerial Office*. Mr. Crofton I know will admit your *Notion* in the *Genus*, an inferior *Minister of State*, or *Servant in a Family*, must minister, as well as a *Minister of the Gospel*: but that specificall act which shall difference the *special Ministrations* of these *special Relations*, and several capacities, was the thing enquired; and what is the *formal ratio* of the *Ministerial Office*, in the *ministration of solemn publick worship*, is the *Question*. To tell us, *Ministration is the formal act of ministration*, is good *Scepticism*; *Dolosus versatur in generalibus*, the *formal act* of the *Ministerial Office* is to minister; but *quomodo*? is the question. To hold your *Lord Bishops Stirrup*, or the *Candle* to an *Archdeacon*, will not sure fulfil the *ministry* of a *Gospel Minister*; yet it is *ministration*. In your next tell us what is the *formal act* of the *Gospel Ministerial Office*, which will specifically difference it from *ministration in the general*; and then you will see little cause to cry out to *make modification of the act*,

all, the all it self, is to make apparel the man; for modification of Ministration came not into the question; but that modification of solemn Worship is the formal all of Ministration, was and is asserted: and, Sir, the cutting and making of Cloth in such and such a shape, is the formal ministration of a Tailor, who will easily see your Answer to be a man of Clouts. But you pass to the Objection.

Imposition and prescription in Prayer and Sacraments, is applicable unto Preaching. To this you give a four-fold Answer.

1. *A Sermon is never the worse for being well digested. True; if it be the Preachers own meditation, much the better.*

2. *If it be seen and allowed by Authority, I know no harm in it. Nor I neither: but this is not necessary.*

3. *This course (if not endless) would more secure peace and solid edification of the Church. I deny that, unless by the Popish guard, Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion. But, Sir,*

What are these to a Sermon not studied, much less digested by the Preacher? not communicated to, but composed by pretenders to Authority? making Ministers to have no work to do qua Ministers, but to read what they have written, which is the nature and form of Homilies, and these exclusively imposed, which may as well be admitted as the Liturgie!

4. *When Presbyterians do preach other mens printed Sermons. Name any such, who so do, let them bear their blame; I know no Presbyterians who so do: But if you, Sir, please to enquire in the Parish of Christs-Church, or Martins Ludgate, London, or Henly in Suffex, you may hear of Sons of the Church who stuck not to preach Mr. Croftons own printed Sermons: But these are preparing for Homilie Ministrations.*

You think there is a vast difference between Praying and Preaching: is there not also a difference between these and Sacraments? Prove that Christ taught that Prayer may be comprised in a short Office: He suggested matter, did he determine the mode, terms, words, and expressions of Prayer? If not, what avails this plea? There are not more various Texts in the Bible, then wants in the Church, and both are the Scene for the variety of Gifts to exercise upon. But Sir, your next makes work for the Terra filius. Mr. Croftons instance of the Parish Clerk and People, is not to our prejudice, or his purpose; for they are a general part of the holy priesthood St. Peter speaks of, and it is their duty to bear a part in Gods solemn worship.

Well levell'd, Doctor; I hope we shall no more hear of Clergie distinct

distinct from *Laitie*: The *Parish Clerk* and *People* are part of the *holy Priesthood*; very true: they ought to bear a part in *Gods solemn worship*; undoubtedly true: but must that part be *ministration*, such *ministration* as is the *formal act* of *Gospel ministry*? either so, or you have said nothing; and if so, farewel *Holy Orders*, yea, *solemn Ordination* to the *Ministry*; a man may make himself a *Priest*: Enter *Independency*, the *Archdeacon* hath opened the door: *All the Lords people are holy*, the *holy priesthood*; Ergo, may minister in the *Ministers Office*.

Your next, concerning *School-boys*, doth suggest some Boy read *Mr. Croftons* Position to you; for otherwise, you might have observed, he doth distinguish the *Ministerial Office*, and *Ministerial Act*: and tells you, a boy may perform the *Act*, and queries, Must he therefore be admitted to the *Office*? He never allowed a *Butcher* a blow at an *holy Oxe* or *Lamb*, because he can kill them; he never allowed *Qualification* to conferr an *Office*.

Sir, upon what you have said, *Mr. Crofton* appears not self-condemned, nor condemned by others; but if a *Jury* of *Fresh-men* condemn not your *Logick*, you shall have my *Vote* to be *Senior Lecturer*. Ending your dispute, you pass to your former *Swada*, and affirm.

Mr. Crofton, and his party are bound to submit to the use of a prescribed *Liturgie*. Negatur. You undertake to prove it thus.

To do whatsoever is morally possible, for uniformity and peace sake, is your duty: But to submit to the use of a prescribed *Liturgie* is morally possible; Ergo, to the submit to the use of a prescribed *Liturgie* is your duty.

Though I could, in love to peace, I will not quarrel at the terms of your *Major Proposition*, and deny it: but I deny your *Minor Proposition*, (viz.) To submit to the use of a prescribed *Liturgie*, is not morally possible. You proceed to prove this.

What is not sinfull, and is within our natural power, is morally possible: But to submit to a prescribed *Liturgie* is not sinfull, and is within our natural power; Ergo, To submit to the use of a prescribed *Liturgie* is morally possible.

The *Major* is allowed you; the *Minor*, as to the last Branch may be allowed you: but sometimes our natural power may be under violent restraint, and then possibility may fail.

As to the first branch, it is denied; and you proceed to prove it, (viz.) that to submit to the use of a prescribed *Liturgie* is not sinfull; and you thus argue: What

What is forbidden by no Law, is not sinfull: But to submit to the use of a prescribed Liturgie, is forbidden by no Law; Ergo, To submit to the use of a prescribed Liturgie, is not sinfull.

The Major is allowed you; the Minor I deny: For to submit to the use of a prescribed Liturgie is forbidden in the first Command, which doth require faithfulness in the Office committed to us by the Lord himself; *Ministers of God* cannot without sin become the *Ministers of men*.

2. In specialty; the Law of the Ministerial Office, in its special nature, (which must give Rules to the Ministers acts *qua* Ministerial acts) doth forbid such submission, as *inconsistent with, and destructive to the formal act of the Ministerial Office, (viz.) modifying worship by personal abilities*, notwithstanding what our Opponent hath urged to the contrary,

3. The edifying of the Church by variety of Ministerial Gifts, is a Law which doth forbid such submission, as destructive to that end.

The Apostle indeed bids us hold fast the *form of wholesome words*, but not to hold to the *same words*; to speak the same things, but not in the same syllables: for if so, the Liturgie must be *catholick* to all Christians, in all places and ages of the World, and that in the *Greek Language onely*. Had this Doctor read Mr. Crofton's Argument on this Question against D. G. he sure would not have thus disputed, [*Submission to Superiors is a duty*; but our *judicium rationale* must judge their Mandate to be *licitum & honestum*, which in this case we cannot do; and then our Dilemma is manifest, *Shall we obey God or man?* judge you.

Now, Sir, your holding your Conclusion is not in my power to hinder; but if your Premises be not push'd down, let all men of reason judge.

You have, Sir, been at the pains to transcribe Mr. Crofton's *Creed* in point of *Church Communion*; *præterea nihil*; you deny no one Article, nor dispute not against them: Herein then we are agreed; onely, Sir, let me tell you, that *freedom from corruptions and disorders* must be secured to the Church by the ways God hath directed, not by words which men have dilated, and by their unwarranted power determined.

I having repelled the assaults, and dissipated the Forces of the *Jerubbaal Right*, must now encounter the *Left Wing* of this *Armado*: In ad-*Rediviv*, drefs to which, my courage is checked by observing the *Antesignanus* and Captain that appeareth in the Front; not afraid of his force,

force, but ashamed that any called a *Presbyter*, should engage in such a *Church-subverting design*, and that with such weapons which the most rigid Separatists will be ashamed to take up : but be he Son or Brother, the Relation may restrain what the weight of the Warfare doth necessitate : With him therefore I must take a turn ; the rather, for that many have sounded in my ears his proud alarm, " That Mr. *Crofton* himself cannot now have any thing to say against him, his opinion and practice, unless he mind to have " the last word, and resolve he will not be convinced. That this man may not abide wise in his own conceit, I must once more enforce the Rebuke given him, and advise him, [to reflect the willfull affectation of a Title which can no way appertain to him, (*viz.*) *Jerubbaal* ; whereas *Baal* is not the object of his Plea, nor is he the *Gideon* that threw down and pleaded against *Baal*. With what face doth this man conclude the *Common-Prayer Book* is *Baal*, and not once consider or resolve Mr. *Crofton's* expostulations hereupon? " My good friend, let it be seriously resolved, is there no difference between *Israel* and *Judah*? *Rome*, and a Reformed Church? between a calling on God, the onely true God, in the Name of " Christ, though in a defective, rude, confused, and unfitting order, " and praying unto Saints and dumb Idols? Though our order of " Divine Service be a *Roman* dreg of some dangerous distastefull " influence, yet it is not Popery : Shall we not bless God, and rejoyce in *England*, as brought out of *Babylon*, though some *Babylonish* Vestures, Rites, and Orders, which ought to be abandoned, " are retained, yea, returned into her? When these things are well resolved, will not this *Baal* appear a *babe of his fancy*, without any real existence? Knoweth not this *Pleader*, that the mistake of the object doth mis-guide the act, and make reproof a groundless calumny?

Reformat.
not Sepa-
rat. p. 26,
36.

But if the Liturgie must be accounted *Baal*, is this man the *Jerubbaal*? When? by what Plea? in whose judgment, except his own? Let me say over again what I said in my last; hath not Mr. *Crofton* written and preached against it? Hath not Mr. *Crofton* suffered for his opposition to it? Doth not Mr. *Crofton's* papers, against which this man appeareth, plead convincingly against it? The enemy being Judge, is there any more open *Jerubbaal* in our Age than Mr. *Crofton*? This man appeareth against Mr. *Crofton's* limitation, and due bounds set unto mens affection; inferring what the premises will not allow, and proudly affects to be called *Jerubbaal*: Oh vanity! oh folly! But

Jerub. justified, p. 2.

Secondly,

Secondly, I would advise this Combatant to review what he hath written; for verily I cannot without grief and shame, observe the *Non-sence, ignorance, and error*, with which this unanswerable Peice aboundeth: I shall, for his humiliation, note it in each Paragraph of his Book; and the rather, because his wild and confused method admits no regular Ratiocination. Note therefore,

His Preface enters with an out-cry, That the Rebuke I last gave him (being big-bellied with Satyrical invectives, slanders, and revilings) would better become a Shimei; then a Levite: But he specifies not one reviling term; how big-bellied soever the Rebuke appeared, it is manifest no one was brought forth: I must therefore tell mine Antagonist, stubborn and scornfull Sons do conclude the Fathers just Rebukes are railing; let sober men judge the sobriety of so just Rebukes, as his *Jerubbaal* provoked.

His next Paragraph complaineth, that he was charged with a mistake, a total mistake, a gross mistake, which he saith, is to him matter of wonder; and to whom can it be other, who is but in the least acquainted with the occasion, end and scope of his writings. I cannot but note the clearness of his Reason, or rather non-sence of his Argumentation: Mr. Crofton blamed (he saith censured) his non-communication at *Lawrence Jewry Church-door*, and demanded (he saith challenged) an answer to his Reformation not Separation: this gave occasion to his writing; he aimed at truth and duty, that was the scope and end of his writing. All this admitted, what followeth? That it was impossible he should mistake, totally mistake, grossly mistake? So that he must hence wonder to be charged therewith; and all the world knowing this occasion, and end, cannot but wonder with him. An exact Marks-man, that provoked to shoot, and intending well, is thereby put under an impossibility of missing the Mark! But could he think, all men will judge the occasion and end of his undertaking would so clear his understanding, as to keep him from mistake? If good intentions could destroy an erroneous judgment, there would not be so many mistakes in the world as there is: Be the occasion and end of this mans undertaking what it will, was he not mistaken in Mr. Crofton, when he called him, printed him the *Mecenas and Advocate for the English Liturgie*? Is it now out of mistake, that in this second piece he saith, *The Altar of Baal, by him thrown down, is by me repaired, and my design is its resurrection*? Result not these terms of propriety, *Tour novum organum, your man-devised Liturgie,*

*Jerubb.
Rediviv.
p. 11, 13,
14, 17.*

Liturgie, your Divine Service, your blasted Liturgie, out the total and gross mistake of Mr. Crofton, and his Plea; Will this man have the impudence to justify the Calumny of the wicked, That Mr. Crofton is an Apostate, revolted from what he witnessed? Let him draw it into an Indictment; Mr. Crofton shall abide the trial, though his Jury be a pack of his worst enemies, of superstitious Sons of the Church, and separating Sells. I could, for the honour of Reformation, wish, that men had not more cause to wonder that this man can do nothing but mistake, and persist with folly in a mistake, as it is too manifest in this his second Tract; then to wonder, that notwithstanding his good occasion and end, he was mistaken, totally mistaken, grossly mistaken; for the last is incident to the best of men.

Page. 3.

His third Paragraph tells us of five Queries, on Resolution of which dependeth the decision of this controversy. But, Sir, my last drew the Controversie to a much narrower Crisis; one single Question, which well resolved, would end this strife, (viz.) Whether the Liturgie, being an unlawfully constituted mode of solemn publick Worship, be so far unlawfull, or unlawfull in that kind or quality of unlawfulness, which will constitute a warrantable ground or reason for non-communion in the worship of God ministred by the same? Jerubbaal j. i. st. p. 25. Near this question you do not, you dare not come; your War would be too soon ended, and your wordy Army too soon disbanded, if you should fight so close. Sir, have you studied nothing but Sceptiscism, to avoid the Question by multiplying Queries of your own framing? Are you a Sophomore, so subtil to thun the Question stated, and dispute the Queries of your own brain? You may, Sir, be your own Antagonist all your days, with much ease and pleasure to your fancy, but with little profit to others. Yet before you buckle to your work, you say you will enfeeble my Plea, which you can more stoutly call cavils and exceptions, then convincingly gain-say or contradict.

The fourth Paragraph doth therefore observe the Crisis of Mr. Croftons Plea to be communion in Gods worship ministred by the Liturgie, not communion in the Ministerial mode: but this observed, is passed with a scornfull note of Crambe recolta, occurring 20. times; not once considering it was so frequently inculcated on design to clear his dull capacity, who could, or would not observe it in Mr. Crofton's Reform. not Separat. And, Sir, I yet see not but this Crambe recolta may be digst up to you 200. times, before you will digest the same: Solomon hath indeed told us, though we bray a

fool

fool in a mortar, he will not understand. I wish you had turned on the hinge of the controversy; I should deny learned self to consider any strenuous argumentation, which would demonstrate this forcible Plea to be what you please to call it, a plausible evasion.

The fifth Paragraph fills time and paper to tell men, what he ^{ibid.} that runneth may read, (viz.) Mr. Crofton's dispute is about popular, not Ministerial communion. Yet here I cannot but observe his mistake of the Question; which he saith is, *Whether this communion be Duty?* He should observe, it is the *Licet*, not the *Debet*, of this communion, which Mr. Crofton doth affirm; he never disputed this Communion to be a duty binding *semper*, but *lawfull*, and *made duty* by inevitable necessity onely: He always affirms Communion with a *non obstante*, notwithstanding the *Liturgie*; and onely, when we cannot have solemn publick worship without the same: the utmost of Mr. Crofton's affirmation is, *The Liturgie maketh not a warrantable ground for secession from Gods Church and worship.* But this mans good intention must make all men wonder he should be charged to mistake.

Yet, Sir, you are well skill'd in a *λογιστική*, when you tell us, ^{pag. 4.} You had reason confidently to affirm, Mr. Crofton said, the *Liturgie* or *Common-Prayer* is an act of solemn publick worship. This denied, you plead a passage which onely seems to suggest it; and in which it is not said: Is, Sir, this the strife about words condemned by the Apostle, for a man to deny he spake what he is unjustly charged to have spoken? But of this enough, it being personal. But, Sir, I cannot a little wonder at your strange confidence, in again fathering the fancie of your own brain on Mr. Crofton, in what you call his *Dumb Argument*, when you know it hath in his name been disowned; and the abominable sequel thereof, together with its inconsistency with his Question, and the scope of his Plea been fully demonstrated in my *Fernb. justif.* p. 5. 6. Can you out-face me, and Mr. Crofton too, that he will not after recollection say, that is a monstrous Argument, which maketh the *Liturgie essential* to the sanctification of the Lords day, so as that the Lords day cannot be sanctified where the Service-book is not attended, assented to, and acted in? and doth not this naturally flow from your fancied conclusion? Were you not rebuked for this in my last? and was not Mr. Crofton's Argument put into form, that you might see its force; Man, be not obstinate.

The sixth Paragraph doth assert a Notion, which admitted, maketh set forms of Prayer *essential* to Communion in all solemn pub-

lick Prayer, (*viz.*) *The Adhibition of his Amen is as real communion in the Ministerial mode of worship, as the personal acting by conclamation, popular responds, and groundless variation of gesture, and the like.* Sir, I agree with you, *magis & minus non variant speciem*: Prove Mr. Crofton's *Amen* to be as real, though not so extensive communion as the fore-mentioned personal acts, and I will undertake he shall retract his principle and practice too. But, Sir, you are the first that ever made the external ministerial mode the adequate object of the peoples *Amen*; all others refer it to the matter, and the matter only: and truly, Sir, if it be true, I must be excused, if I refuse to joyn with a *Scotch-man* in Prayer; for they are, of all men, no little incident to disorder, in their conceived, self-framed Prayers. Nor do I see how I can be secured against the guilt of that confusion and disorder of expression to which all men are subject, save only by seeing the Form of Prayer to which I must give mine *Amen*, and being well assured from it the Minister shall not vary: This, Sir, necessitateth a *Liturgie*, and was suggested to you in my last, had you pleased to observe it. Sir, I judged *Amen* to be the act of my *judicium discretionis*, to be adhibited as mine understanding apprehended the matter prayed for: I have heard some Petitions put up to God, which I durst not enforce with my *Amen*. I presume you will not deny to pray with me; and yet (as you and I stand informed) you could not adhibit your *Amen* to all that I must ask of God. I conceive, if my *Amen* be at the command of mine Understanding, in reference to any matter, it is much more such in reference to every external Form, and Ministerial mode of Prayer. And now, Sir, Mr. Crofton's Nuntio will tell you, that admitting the *Smeilymman* observation of the *Letany* (which holds not in any part, save the Deprecations, and that also is disputable) to be true: Mr. Crofton's *judicium discretionis* commanding his *Amen*, can direct and dispose a silent observation of such a popular interruptions to solemn publick Worship. Sir, if you will make *Amen* contract the Guilt of the mode of Prayer, you must go to work again; for I will confidently affirm, in this opinion you stand alone, and will stand alone.

Page 61

The seventh Paragraph is the wild frolick of a foolish fancy; as if my noting the *Liturgie* to be a political order and direction, did confound it with the *Directory*; this is a vanity so visible, that I will say no more to it, save this, If you have no more wit then to play with your shadow, enjoy your sport; what is this to the question in dispute?

The

The eighth Paragraph is like the seventh: In it you note, with Pag. 7. seeming pity, Mr. Crofton's necessity of practice in prison; but, good Sir, what necessity (more then that of conscience and duty) constrained Mr. Crofton to state the Principle he now asserts, when he was at liberty, worshipping God in purity and power, and contradicting the late Bishop of *Worcesters* advancing the *Liturgie*? Deal you faithfully with God, his Cause, and People, when you suggest Mr. Crofton's new principle and practice was extorted by a violent necessity? The Lord judge these Censures. (2.) Your Notion of *Civil presence* comes again to be observed. (3.) It is well the Plea of necessity groweth frivolous to you; it is not so to others; they miss some integrals of *Worship*. (4.) I should be loth to conclude, set Forms of *Preaching and Prayer* (with soundness of Doctrine in both) were England's *Ichabod*; these were imposed, and all *Preaching* silenced, for some time, by the Proclamation of King *Edw. 6.* and Gods Ark and Glory was then returning: I wish not to see so dark a cloud in Gods Sanctuary; yet fear to conclude (if a lawfull Ministry and substantial Ordinances abide) that Gods presence is removed. I yet fear to eat your bread of secrecy, and to drink your stollen waters, though sweet, lest the dead be there, and such guests be in the depths of Hell. The house of an Obed-edom may entertain an exiled Ark; but not have comfort, or give any guard to *Corah's* company.

The ninth Paragraph is, in my judgment, an eminent piece of P. *ibid.* Non-sence: To my Objection, *The personal* guils of *Hophni* and *Phineas* could not defile the Church; you answer, *Personal* corruptions are there contra-distinct to real, not to publick, as it seems you understand me. Good Sir, what understand you by real corruptions? corruptions indeed? Is not all personal corruptions real corruptions? Are personal faults onely imaginary guile? It is then good sinning alone. Sir, I never understood real opposed to personal, but it signified publick. Consider well how *Civilians* and *Casuists* distinguish an Oath into *reale & personale*; and tell me what you understand by real, distinct from publick, and opposed to personal, that I may understand you.

The tenth Paragraph doth enforce the necessity of a groundless distinction of participation by profession, and joynt communion; but addeth no new matter, onely referreth to *Ferubbaal*: Thisthen I turn back to *Ferubbaal* justified.

The eleventh Paragraph noteth, that Mr. Crofton will deny that Pag. 8. there

there are many, or indeed any members of the Church catholic, who never had opportunity of associating themselves with, or of joynt communion in the solemn worship of God, in a particular Church: and answereth the same with needless distinctions, and manifest non-sence. As (1.) by universal is meant the catholic militant Church, comprehending visible and invisible; yet note, his Jerubbaal did determine it to be visible onely, pa. 19. and the catholic Church must be the subject of solemn publick Worship, and Gods Ordinances, capable of association and joynt communion in them; of these the invisible part of the Church are not capable. (2.) That a man may be a member of the invisible, without opportunity of joynt communion in outward Ordinances. I do not onely imply, but I speak out; but what is this to our purpose? Nor will I deny, a professor may be a believer; but that maketh him not a member of the Church visible: Profession is the ground of visible Church-membership, but it is not the *formalis ratio* thereof; no; that is Baptism, an act of personal association, and joynt communion; which must needs have its opportunity in all that enjoy it. I say as his greater Sophies, (ignorantly quoted) *A professor is visible, a believer invisible; the believer may be a professor of the same faith, and not partake in the same ordinances:* Yet it will not hence follow, there are any or many members of the Church visible, who never had an opportunity of joynt communion in solemn publick worship; for all such must be incorporated by Baptism; without which, the best professors and true believers must be *foro Ecclesie* judged without the Church.

The twelfth Paragraph, concerning Conventicles, tells us, *A society of persons ten, twenty, thirty, or forty, amongst whom is a Minister celebrating true Divine Worship, according to the will of Christ, by the assistance of his Spirit, and in his Name; not causelessly and unjustly separating from a true Church, is no Conventicle, or Schismatical Assembly.* Who ever said such an Assembly was a Conventicle? Jerubbaal justified told you of twenty, thirty, or forty private members, assembled distinct from, and opposite to a Church, an holy Convocation: And I say again, if the Congregations in England be true Churches, and secession from them (as it yet seemeth to be) unwarrantable and groundless; though twenty, thirty, or forty, with a Minister, constitute themselves a counter-Church, opposite to these Assemblies, and therein administer Church-ordinances; I see not how to acquit them from the repute and reality of a Conventicle, and Schismatical Assembly: Nor will Christ's promise of his presence be any prop
to

to their Fabrick, who are not met in his Name; for *God is a God of Order.*

We are at length arrived to his five Quæries before mentioned; Pag. 9. by himself stated, and so best resolved.

The first is this; *What is that which may warrant and acquit from Quæri. 1. Schism, a persons non-communication with the Church of England in the worship alledged to be ministred by her Liturgie, or Common-Prayer?*

I must here note, that though he come not close to the Question in dispute, yet he cometh somewhat nearer; and can now mention the subject, *worship*, distinct from his adjunct, the *Liturgie* by which it is ministred: so that he hath learned to speak in an entire Proposition, *worship ministred by the Liturgie*; I hope he hath so clear reason as to discern the subject, *Worship*: the Predicate ministred by the *Liturgie*, are the parts of this Proposition; and the *worship ministred*, not the *Liturgical ministration*, is the object of his Communion, or non-Communion, controverted under this Quærie; which he resolveth in certain Propositions, whereof the first is,

Communion with this part of the Church is a Duty, &c. This is square to Mr. Croftons assertion; onely I would advise him to revise the wording of it, for it soundeth non-sence in mine ears. 1 Propo-
fir.

He noteth an Objection, *Reading the Word is a publick Ordinance* Pag. 10. of God, and part of publick *Worship*: He answereth, *True; who ever denied the thing is appointed? but not the measure, or quantum; he enjoyeth it in Textual occasional Reading in the Sermon preached.* But, good Sir, is not *solemn Reading*, distinct from, and opposite to *textual and occasional Reading*, a part of *solemn Worship*? Cast your eye on *Nehem. 8. 3. Luke 4. 16. Acts 13. 15, 27. 15. 21.* Consult the practise of the Jews, and primitive Christians, the determinations of Fathers, ancient and modern Divines Systems, and Common-places in Divinity, especially Expositions on the fourth Commandment, tell me which of them assert not *solemn Reading*, distinct from *Preaching and its accidents*, to be a distinct part of *solemn publick worship*? and which of them will conclude *textual and occasional Reading* to be the performance of it? Is not your fancy in this manifestly ridiculous?

The second Proposition resolving this Quærie, is a most strange; 2 Propo-
ranting, uncharitable (if I may not say impious) Notion, (viz.) fir.
The worship administred, or administrable by the English Liturgie, or publick set-Form, considered as such, and in a complex state, appeareth
(as

(as yet) to be none of that *Worship* of which *God* is the *Author*, the *Gospel* the *Rule*, the *practice* *Apostolick* the *pattern*; but *Cultus adulterinus*, meer adulterate worship, a piece of *Superstition*, arbitrary *Devotion*, *Scripture-bitten will-worship*, *supererogatory service*, *Law-struck Tradition and Ordinance of Man*. Whither will the man run? This proved, is enough to warrant, yea, to necessitate secession from the English Church: but we must believe it on the Magisterial confident say-so of this Grave Dictator; for no proof is so much as offered. But doth the man know what he saith? or whereof he doth affirm? that he thus ranteth, not against the *Liturgie*, (that may be born) but against the *worship in abstracto*, distinct from the *Liturgie*, is to me very strange. The *Worship administred*, or *administtable* by the *Liturgie*, is *cultus adulterinus*, no worship of *God*, is his Position; the most rigid Separatists will not say it. If this be so, well might Doctor Owen acquit Independency from Schism, by pleading the Church lost its being under Popery; gathering of Churches must needs be a duty; yet no gathered Church hath any worship of *God*, or any other the *cultus adulterinus*, &c. For they have no other worship then what is *administtable* by the English *Liturgie*. Good Sir, what is the *worship administred* or *administtable* by the English *Liturgie*? Is it not solemn reading the *Scriptures*, invocation of *God*, *Baptism* and the *Lords Supper*? Pray you, Sir, is not *God* the *Author*, *Gospel* the *Rule*, and *practice* *Apostolick* the *Pattern* of these? If these be not the *worship administred*, and *administtable* by the *Liturgie*, give us the name of it, that we may enquire its nature: Protestants have had no other worship since King *Edward* the sixth his dayes; true Christians have had no other since *Jesus Christ* his dayes: have the one and other been left in approach to *God* without his worship? yea, with adulterate worship, &c. How much will this fall short of Blasphemy, not onely against Protestants, but Christians, and the *God* of both? I profess, I tremble that I hold you so close to the Crisis of our Controversie, that you should break out with such a ranting notion, which doth raze the foundation of the Church. Your *sensu composito in individuo*, *connexio & qua talis*, will not relieve you; for mean you what you will by these, the *worship in abstracto* is the subject of these, and of your Proposition, predicated *cultus adulterinus*, &c. And, Sir, lest we should mistake you, you have not onely explained it by the actual administration; *worship administred* would not serve your turn, but you add the very posse thereof, and determine against

against the *worship administrable by the English Liturgie*. You may, Sir, by this notion help the simple to blasphemous words; but can never make a sober understanding Profelyte, or obtain any rational second, that knoweth how to understand a Proposition: Yet this fancy I find to be the Line which hath led you into the Labyrinth in which you are intangled. Be serious, and see whether it be not the snare of the Devil; out of which the Lord redeem you.

On this Notion you proceed to resolve Objections: of which you note,

There is in the Common Prayer the substance of Divine worship, 1 Object. though disorderly administred; the essential form of Prayer, a calling upon God in the Name of Christ for things agreeable to his will, &c. To this you answer, conceding the matter of the Petitions, as that you will not dispute; and I suppose you will not question the matter of the Sacraments. The *Form* you deny not; onely follow your fancy, *the Name of Christ*; which, you say, Mr. Crofton hath with disdain disowned. That I, in Mr. Crofton's name, disowned it, is true; the *disdain* is your own fancy: What one word of disdain is expressed? I will transcribe my sentence, that you and others may observe why and how I do disown this sence of the Name of Christ. "Sir, I will assure you, Mr. Crofton did not understand by the "Name of Christ, the Will of Christ; and yet I must tell him, it *Jerub. just.* "is but one Doctors opinion, that this is not a right description of p. 27. "Prayer: He might have been pleased to observe, in the same page, "Mr. Crofton determined the matter must be according to the Will "of God; and Will of Christ doth require some adjunct qualities "which come not into the definition; but in *the Name of Christ*; "that is, for his sake, merits, and mediation, cannot be left out. Note, Sir, *The Name of Christ* doth not exclude the *Will of Christ*; both have their places, and due respect: *the will of Christ*, in reference to the *matter*, is essential; the *name of Christ*, in reference to the *form*, is made essential; the *will of Christ*, in reference to the *mode*, in adjunct qualities, *gravity of expression, fervency of affection, and reverence in demeanour*, is made necessary, but not essential: And from what Divine doth Mr. Crofton differ in this distribution of the parts of Prayer? For herein (to use your own terms) *Prayer* in genere, is *worship*; and in specie, *such instituted worship*. But you proceed, and say;

I mutter; Sir, I speak it out, The will of Christ requires gravity Pag. 11.
in expression, reverence in demeanour, &c. which come not into the defi-

nition of Prayer, as essential to its form. Nor, Sir, can you gain-say this: and, Sir, it would seem, yea, it really is so, that if the essential form of Prayer depend upon, or consist in a conformity to the will of Christ, that no Prayer is such, but what hath those qualifications: for, Sir, if so, a vain thought, and word, or rude demeanour, doth destroy the Prayer. But you say;

Two Commandments are confounded. But, Sir, by whom? is it not by your self in your very present distinction? For you say, the *modus, outward manner of worship doth belong to the second Commandment, cujus contrarium verum est.*

Pa. 12, 13,
14, 15.

You enter a discourse of your Orthodoxy; in which if you be not Heterodox, I have no skill in Divinity. I will not strictly scan each word, your discourse is wild; but these Notions are obvious.

Pa. 12, 13.

That calling on God in the Name of Christ is required in the third Command. And yet, Sir, this is the *forma informans* of Prayer as instituted Worship; for Nature will teach men to call on God.

The external mode of Prayer doth belong to the second Command. And yet it is not essential to Prayer, as instituted Worship.

That Prayer which is not agreeable for necessary modes and qualifications, as gravity of expression, reverence in demeanour, &c. to the third Commandment, may be justly denied to have the compleat essential form of instituted worship. If this be true, Prayer it self is impossible to sinfull men, and glorified Saints need it not.

The ministerial mode in Prayer is medium cultus; Which you were told is but cultus vehiculum: the medium is invocation, the ministerial mode is onely the vocal instrument between God and the people.

Praying by the Liturgie is as praying before an Image: And yet in the one the Image, in the other, God, and God onely, is the proximate immediate object of the Prayer: Men praying by the Liturgie, pass to God himself, nullo medio interveniente; but praying to an Image, sets God at a distance, and salutes his Gentleman Usher.

Upon these and the like Notions you infer your principle, and justify what I thought you would have retracted with grief and shame, *That God is not worshipped by the Liturgie.* Hereupon, you frivolously, and to no purpose, mention many Authors: I pray you study in what they have written on the third Command, with this note; "Many things are noted as sinfull, to be avoided and abandoned, which yet existing do not vitiate the subject, nulli-
" sic

“ he Gods Worship about which they do converse, and will not
 “ therefore warrant secession or separation.

You highly insult in my concession the *Liturgie is evil, a positive evil*. I grant it you again: but, Sir, is there no *evil, positive evil*, but against the second Commandment? Is all *evil, positive evil*, in other mens act, a warrant for my separation? And now let us come again to the Question; Is the *Liturgie*, though *evil, a positive evil*, such an *evil*, an evil of that kind and quality, as to warrant separation? If not, what do you gain by what I grant? I tell you, the *Liturgie* is not *medium cultus* within the second Command; but *modus ministerialis* within the third Command. Be it superstitious, your self confess it is not Idolatry.

To your Query concerning the *Corinthian prayers in an unknown* Pag. 15.
tongue; I say, *God was not the object*; things according to his will was not the *matter*, nor was the *Name of Christ the form* thereof; for there was no invocation, there being *vox & præterea nihil*; men heard a voice, but for what, to whom, or through whom it was uttered, they understood not: Now, Sir, is this the *Case of the Liturgie*?

Sir, not to insist on your confused discourses of superstition; that there is *evil, positive evil*, in the *Liturgie*, I deny not; that I, or Mr. Crofton are *Advocates for it*, or the *evils of it*, I do deny; but being convinced all *evil* will not warrant separation; here I stick, and here I hold you; Is the *Liturgie* such an *evil*, of such kind and quality, as to constitute a warrantable ground of secession or separation? I yet stand negative: Come to the Question, and prove that; for *affirmanti incidit probatio*. Your wild discourse concerning the Commandments and Superstition being past, you proceed to answer another Objection by me made:

God (say you) is not worshipped by the *Liturgie*; the *manner* Pag. 17.
and form is humane: To which I objected, so is the *form and mode of a studied Sermon, and conceived Prayer*; is not *God worshipped by them*? To this you first answer by manifest mistake: the *worship is edited humane*, of which man is not onely agent, but author. But my Objection is not of the *Worship administrated, or administrable*; but of the *Liturgie, manner and dress administring*; and hereof I affirm, God hath appointed men to be not onely *Agents*, but *Authors*; according to their wisdom and faithfulness, as *Ministers*; though that be appointed, yet this is arbitrarily eligible by men apted and authorized thereto. Your second Answer, telling us, you call it *humane*

because it proceeds from man originally, is insignificant; for as an external and ministerial mode, it is not *within the second Command*, nor *contrary to Christs Crown Prerogative*, but consonant thereto; for Christ, as King of his Church, hath committed his mind to his Embassadors, and charged them by their own wisdom and faithfulness to put his Worshipp into a due mode, suitable to his Majesty, and his peoples weakness; and this you must know is bottomed on the nature of the Ministerial Office, that Scripture Precept; and is justified by the president of the Apostles practice, who were the Authors of that mode and dress by which they ministered: If then you fancy mans *wisdom of composition of Prayer and Sermon in general*, and mans *will in imposition of his own composed mode*, is contrary to the *will and wisdom of God*, your self, and all Ministers in Gods Church are heteof Guilty; yet they neither may, nor must avoid it. Your third Answer is, That the *essential form of worship administred by the Common-Prayer is justly denied and disproved*. That, Sir, it is *boldly denied*, is very true; but not *justly*; nor yet disproved, I confidently affirm: Yet, Sir, I must pull in my confidence, if the *worship administred and administtable by the Liturgie be not Gods worship*: When this is proved, I shall know in what sence God is *not worshipped by the Liturgie*: but I hope you will find out other worship of God not administtable by the Liturgie; for Word, Prayer, and Sacraments, you affirm, are *cultus adulterinus*. Your fourth Answer cannot but make Liturgical men to laugh: *Studied Sermon, and conceived Prayer*, you say, cannot be said to be *humane*; (you must mean, in the Ministerial mode and dress, invented by mans judgment;) for though *Man is the Agent*, he is *Author of neither*; yet the one and the other is the act of his invention and judgment: *Christ hath directed Preaching and Praying in an edifying manner and method*, and therefore the *Ministerial mode is determined in the Word*: Oh rare Logick! The Lord Mayor requires his meate carved in an handson and honorable manner; therefore he determines the special carving mode. Your next concession, concerning *exegetical, or analytical, or paraphrastical Preaching, &c the wording of Prayer*, is contradictory to this inference; and yet, in the height of non-sence, you proceed to affirm, the *mode and dress is directed in specie, by the general rules of edification and order*: General Rules for the guidance of mans wisdom, have determined the special mode for ministration. Why may not some Son of the Church retort on you, The Liturgie was *enjoyed in specie*, 1 Cor.

14. 12, 26, 40. and *endited in individuo* by the Spirit as dictator, Rom. 8. 26. and be as soon believed, as you affirming it of conceived Prayer? for these two are equally demonstrable in the one, as in the other. And, Sir, let me tell you, *non-sence, tautologie, rude indigested expressions* in conceived prayer, is an evil, a positive evil, as well as the order and method of Common-prayer; and therefore are as cogent to exclude the *injunction* and *enditement of the Holy Ghost*. Do what you can, you most and will find, the *Ministerial mode* is and must be *humane*, subject to humane weakness (which is a positive evil) in ministrations; and Gods Worship must therein and thereby exist betwixt God and his Church; yet this positive evil is not *fathered on the Holy Ghost*.

Your next Paragraph offereth an Answer to my Objection, "Our first Reformers, and *Marian* Martyrs, rejoiced and died under a mode of Worship by which God could not be worshipped, Your Answer is five-fold. Pag. 20.

Your first Answer, by way of concession, tells us, "This was the dark side of those pillars; they were fallible men; Peter might *Judaize*; therefore we must measure truth by rule, and not by their practice. Sir, you might have observed, their practice was not propounded as a pattern, but a proof; that though they *missed it in the Ministerial mode*, yet God was worshipped by them, in and by this mode. Sir, God did not leave them in approach to him with *adulterate worship*, whilest they witnessed his truth. But, indeed, you observe not the purpose, scope, and strength of any one Objection. The Martyrs abhorred the notion of being *saved onely by true Doctrine*, which they were charged to believe. Would you have us believe they went to Heaven, who witnessed true Doctrine, but worshipped God with *false worship, will-worship, the worship administred and administtable by the Liturgie*?

Your second Answer doth deny matter of fact, "That these Martyrs rejoiced in, and died for the Liturgie; as if Life and Liturgie came in competition, you freely deny. You may, Sir, deny the Sun doth shine. This man is sure well-read in our Book of Martyrs. Did not *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and others, joyfully compose the Liturgie? Did not all that then feared God in England, rejoyce at the establishment of the Liturgie by the Statute of King Edw. 6. Did not *Philpot* appear in its defence at the Convocation? Did not old *Latimer* justify it in his *Disputation at Oxford*?

ford? Did not Rogers our Proto-martyr approve it, in his *Speech* digested to declare to the Commissioners who condemned him? Did not all that then suffered minister their last publick and dying devotions by the Liturgie? Did not the Congregations (who then necessarily served God in corners) worship by the Liturgie? Did not they wish and wait for the return of the Liturgie, and rejoyce in its revival by *Elizabeth*? Came not *Life and Liturgie in competition*, when the Articles objected against, and on which *Thomas Watts*, *Thomas Osmond*, *Derrick Carver*, *John Launder*, *Mr. Rongh* the Minister, and *Cuthbert Sympson*, Deacon of the congregation in *Bowe-Church-yard*, were condemned, was, that they used, attended, loved, laboured to restore the *English Service*, or *Liturgie*? Concluded not good *Mr. Bradford*, They fell under Gods curse for calling good evil, and evil good, who condemned the *English Service* of Heresie? How far short is he who concludeth, and confidently affirmeth the worship administred or administable by the Liturgie, is not Gods worship, but *cultus adulterinus*? God is not worshipped by the Liturgie. Sir, turn over the Book of Martyrs, you may run and read these demonstrations of the matter of fact; it cannot be denied: Yet I tell the Zealots for the Liturgie, they insert more upon this practice, then these premisses will allow; for whilst I am forced to producethem against this most rigid Separatist, to prove God worshipped by the Liturgie; I do deny their practice to be any way cogent, to confine all, or any ministrations of Gods worship to this mode and Liturgie.

Reformat.
not Separ.
p. 44, 45.

Your third Answer, of the disparity between their case and ours, hath been fully answered by *Mr. Croston*, and me; who hath told you, the difference is *gradual*, not *real*; the worship of God was, is, and must be always one and the same, though the Ministerial mode do, and ought to vary.

Your fourth Answer, *ad hominem*, is indeed most judicious; I affirm, "Ministers may not lawfully minister by the Liturgie; therefore all that did, or do hereby minister, do minister by a "sinfull and unlawfull Form of Worship, a formal positive evil. I did, I do so affirm; what then? I did not affirm, "The Worship "administred, or administable by this sinfull mode, was not "Gods Worship, or *cultus adulterinus*; or that God was not "worshipped by the Liturgie. But I affirm the contrary.

I did also affirm this evil, *formal positive evil*, to be a *personal evil*, consistent with, whilst conversant about Gods true worship, and therefore

therefore no ground of separation; I affirmed *salvability* under this evil, *positive evil*. And herein your Censure is a manifest breach of Charity; you conclude the *Martyrs had not Gods worship*, but *adulterate false worship*; which is inconsistent with salvation; for otherwise, the very Devils may dance in hope of Heaven; for they believe and tremble, yea, and profess *true Doctrine*: I charge a defect in *circumstantials*; you in the *subject and substance*: I reprove a sin of *weakness*, consistent with salvation; you the *height of wickedness, adulterate worship*, which concludeth its subjects, living and dying (as you cannot deny the Martyrs to have done, if your Notion be true) under it, in utter impossibility of salvation: Have you not cause to sing, *jam sumus ergo pares*?

Your fifth Answer is, *The Martyrs devotion was not confined to the Liturgie*. Nor is theirs who use it, and administer by it; or ours who attend the same.

Your third Proposition resolving this first Query concerning Pag. 21. the *expulsion of the Liturgie*, I pass, as not concerned in it; consenting to your Conclusion, though grieved to see you give so much advantage to *Liturgical Zealots*, as by your weakness and wildness of Argumentation you have done: I say, it ought not to be; but being, will not warrant a separation.

The Objections you take from me, I will observe your Answers to.

The first is *Mr. Crofton's sence of scandal*. Your Answer doth witness, you either did not read, or did not regard and consider *Mr. Crofton's Plea to the Barr of Scandal*; you would else have seen his care of, and *compassion to the weak*; his *concession of scandal* in all acts of *liberty, & sui juris*; and his neglect of scandal onely when it doth obviate his *duty*. But you insult here, as every where, on manifest mistake, wonder at the charge whilest you will.

Your fifth Proposition is your Conclusion, built on the fore- Pa. 26, 27. noted horrible and erroneous premises, and must be consonant therunto; I will to it say no more: but I deny the Conclusion.

Your second Query, as a species of the first, is of the same nature, and in it included, discussed, and resolved; yet you do particularly state it thus: *What is that which may warrant and acquit from Schism, a persons non-communication with the Church of England, in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, under the present mode, manner, and method of administration?* Quer. 2.]

In

In this Query, I cannot but note, that the *Lords Supper*, as in the former *worship*; abstracted from the *Ministerial mode*, is proposed as the Object of non-communion.

Your Answer to this Query is general, and granted you in *Thesis*; That if one cannot communicate in the *Lords Supper* without sin, he is warranted in his non-communion: But your Hypothesis and Assumption is yet denied. Nor can your horrid breach of Charity pass without observation, That the mode, manner, and method of administration, maketh the *Lords Supper* poison: whereby you must conclude, that all who have, all who do communicate in this Ordinance, thus ministr'd, have received poison: Yet you give us no proof for this Martyr-blaspheming, Saint-damning Notion. But you pretend to answer some of mine Objections.

1 Object.
pag. 98.

1. *What superstitions and corruptions attend the Ministration of the Lords Supper, in which he must personally act, so as to become guilty of the same?* You answer, Two, the Service, and the Gesture; Common-prayer and kneeling. But, Sir, you have not proved the communicants personal acting in Common-prayer; nor an impossibility of receiving the *Lords Supper* without this gesture: Suppose these warrantable reasons, your secession cannot be warranted by them, until you have essay'd all means for publick communion without them; in which, I am sure, you might have found a possibility of enjoying this, with at least connivance as to those Ceremonies which call for personal action.

Your Plea, that the gesture of kneeling is imposed, is merely frivolous; King James his Proclamation was no Law; the Statute of 25 Hen. 8. extendeth not to Successors; but if it do, his now Majesties Declaration concerning Ecclesiastical affairs, hath discharged the Canon challenging this Authority; the Common-Prayer Book doth imply, and suppose, not impose this gesture: your reason is as weak in matters of Law, as of Divinity. And, Sir, personal acting in the Service and Ministration, being as it may be avoided, it will be an hard dispute, whether the Gesture imposed will constitute a sufficient Barr to so great Priviledge, and so certain Duty: But that it maketh the *Lords Supper* poison, express poison, is out of dispute to men of modesty and charity, who dare not conclude all in Hell, who have received, and do receive the Elements kneeling. I am, Sir, no Advocate for this Gesture; but I abominate your venomous Notion.

Object. 2.
pag. 30.

Your second Objection is *ad hominem* thus; Corruptions in points
of

gesture, are to Mr. Crofton a warrantable ground of non-communication: But, corruptions in point of gesture are corruptions extrinsecal and circumstantial; Ergo, Some corruptions extrinsecal and circumstantial, are a warrantable ground for non-communication. I pray you, Sir, when, and where did Mr. Crofton say, Corruptions in point of gesture is a warrantable ground for non-communication? I find it not in any of his writings: I say indeed, Mr. Crofton put by communion because of the gesture, which is his personal act, and he judgeth sinfull, is barred, by violence driven, he doth not go: This, Sir, is not repugnant to what I said, The worship attended with circumstantial corruptions, may with safety, and must in duty be used; for, Sir, every sinfull act, personally done, becometh a substantial corruption; but done by others awfully, and about Gods worship, it is circumstantial, and extrinsecal, and becometh not my Guilt. Again, Sir, your Argument a fortiori, hath the little force of your whole Argumentation; If corruption in point of gesture be a warrantable ground for non-communication (which you falsely say is confessed) then much more the Liturgie: Sir, here is a meer non sequitur; for the gesture (if sinfull) is the personal act of the Communicant, who is wholly mute, and passive, in the Liturgical ministration, in which he needeth not to act at all.

Your third Querie is in effect the same with the first and second, concerning the Communion in the Service or Worship exhibited by the Liturgie. In the resolution of which, you run round, like the Horse in his Mill; and whilst I grant you the Liturgie is an evil constitution, as it is a Ministerial mode, you fly upon the Worship ministred and ministrable by it; and tell us, The worship ministred by the Liturgie is not performable by faith; the worship is sinfull; the worship is unlawfull: to these I shall say nothing more then what I have said before; If this Worship ministred (be the ministration what it will) be *cultus adulterinus*, sinfull worship, unlawfull worship, God hath no stated publick worship in the world; for Word, Prayer, and Sacraments are the worship. In your last, Liturgie was the object of your Communion; but in this, worship, distinct from, and opposed to Liturgie, is the object of your non-Communion; that we may know God is not worshipped by the Liturgie, you speak out, the worship is sinfull, not Gods worship, not performable in faith.

Having discoursed at Rovers concerning the subject, worship, Pag 34.
you come to the Predicate, ministred by the Liturgie; and state my

E

Objection;

Objection; The *Liturgie* is onely a *Ministerial mode*, which the people are not to be Judges in; and therefore all the guilt resulting from thence is personal, i.e. peculiar to the Minister. To this you gravely answer, This twenty-year-old Notion is become an Article of Mr. Croftons Creed; and in your Margin you refer to Mr. John Ball. Is age any harm to the Notion? Is it the worse for being stated by Learned, Judicious *John Ball*? No, Sir; these add force and lustre to it, and acquit Mr. Crofton from novelty and singularity in this notion; your notions are not two years old, nor can they claim any other Author, save acute T. P.

Pag. 34.

Secondly, You deny the *Liturgie* is any *Ministrial mode*, more than the Book of Scripture is in the Ministers reading. If so much, Sir, is not that enough? That Gods Word be read in such a *Translation*, *measure*, and *order*, is the ministration humane? And, that Prayer be pronounced in such *method*, *order*, and *expressions*, stated, or immediately conceived, is the *humane ministration* thereof; edifying *expressions*, and reverential manner of delivery, you grant, is the *Ministerial mode*; these may be both exhibited by a limited Liturgie: But, Sir, doth the Liturgie (whatever be its order) do any thing more then exhibit *Word*, *Prayer*, and *Sacraments*; in such an humane mode and dress between God and his People? and is not this the *formalis ratio* of ministration of Gods worship, to which edification and order are separable Adjuncts? Is yet the Liturgie *no Ministerial mode*? Is Prayer read, no Prayer? and Sacraments ministred by prescribed forms, no Sacraments? Is such ministration, no ministration? Will you say it, and stand to it? I may commend (or rather condemn) your confidence: You say,

Pag. 35.

The *Popish Missal* may be termed a *Ministerial mode*: It may so, it is so; yet it may not be attended by the people, because the matter ministred by this *Ministerial mode*, is either *no worship*, or *false worship*: Your parallel between the *Popish Missal* and *Liturgie*, is very square; they are both a *Ministerial mode*; in the *Popish Missal*, the subject matter, the worship, is vitiated; in the *Liturgie*, the subject matter, the worship, is right and good, but the ministration and mode is bad; A full agreement! an excellent Harp and Harrow! The *Popish communicants* contract guilt by communion in *Idolatrous*, *superstitious worship*, ministred by their *Priests* and *Missal*; Ergo, Our people contract guilt by communicating in Gods true and own worship ministred by the *Liturgie*: Rare Reason! but I must remember, the worship is *cultus adulterinus*, and the *Liturgie* is not a *Ministerial mode*. But

Who.

Who is this that crieth out, that is a dangerous Principle, That people may lawfully communicate by that form, mode, and order of worship, which a Minister cannot lawfully administer by? D. G. redivi-
 vus? This quarrel is proper for a Liturgical Considerator. But wherein lieth the danger of this Principle? Such Opiniators fondly try an experiment, how near they may approach to sin without sin. How, Sir? Is distribution of different capacities of Minister & People, and determination of the proper Duties of each, a fond experiment? Is an approach to sin, without sin, so greatly dangerous, especially in the critical, necessarily casuistical part of Divinity? Is a serious consideration of a Case of Conscience, the wanton act of the wild School-men? Will not an Act of Parliament, a penal Law, clear this dangerous Principle, and make you, and many your Profelytes, make this near approach to sin without sin? Doth not the Law, publick Peace, and Order, with Self-preservation, conclude the man under sin, whose condescensions came not near to sin, without sin? If we scape the sin, shall we not bless God, and do any thing with comfort? But

Pag. 35.

Your third Answer is; The people have *Judicium discretionis*, you grant, not of Order and Method, to direct, and determine that; this is proper to the Minister. We are, Sir, in this agreed; but your fancy doth confound the *medium cultus* with the *modus ministerialis*; the last you will not allow, and the first you do not understand; there is the reason of the strife: I pray you, Sir, study the propriety of these terms in reference to Gods Worship; for want of this, you mis-apply Zanchy and all other Authors.

Pag. 36.

Another Objection: Under this Ministerial made the people are purely passive. You answer by way of Question, In what worship are the people active, if not in the worship in question, who cannot deny their Amen to any petition in the Common-Prayer? Who, Sir, denieth the peoples acting in the Worship? The Ministerial mode (which I must and will retain) is the matter in question: You must prove, That the Ministerial mode is the Object of the Peoples Amen. Your supposition doth not evade mine allusion to the Speaker or Recorder; unless you make it certain, that the order and terms of their Speech is determined by the King, and so their Office be destroyed, and reduced to the Act common to every Boy. In the Case of Elies sons, you grant, the people who loathed did not leave the offerings of the Lord: Nor do you urge any Reason cogent to them, which in its general nature is not cogent to us; we have

true worship, and a *lawfull*, though not *Levitical Ministry*: The *Jerub. iust.* force and pertinency of this instance, as also that of the high places, p. 29, 30. is fully urged in my last; I shall onely leave you to review it, and see what you now object is fully answered.

Pag. 39,
40, 41.

Your Notion of *civil presence*, urged in your fourth Question, is so notorious to guard your attendance on a *Mass*, *Alchoran*, or *idolatrous worship*; so repugnant to the principle and practice of Primitive Fathers, and Martyrs, that all sober Christians will see it a fancy, and conclude you will never make a Martyr. I shall not therefore stand to dilate upon it; onely desire you to tell us in your next, what it is shall predicate *Civil presence*? in what lieth the *ratio formalis* thereof? whereby we may difference it from Religious presence? Do you predicate it, *Civil presence ratione subjecti*, because the person present is a *civil person*? If so, Ecclesiastical persons will be at a loss, and your self not defended. Do you predicate it *Civil presence ratione objecti*, the business at which we are present is *civil business*? that will not warrant a presence at Common-Prayer, for that is *Religious* (though in your fancy *false Religion*) *business*.

Do you, as you seem to do, predicate it *Civil presence*, from the reason which doth enforce it, the *Law of a Civil Magistrate*? then presence at *Mass*, at a *Turkish Alchoran*, or *Idolatrous service* will be *civil presence*; for in all these my body, the *suppositum*, is at the Magistrates command. Nor will your self-contradicting notion, That the *Common-Prayer* is not *Heathenish*, or *Popish Idolatry*, any thing relieve you, whilst the *worship administered and administrable* by the Liturgie is *cultus adulterinus*, and as prayer before an *Image*, as is before observed. Then our primitive Martyrs were *Felones de se*, who were destroyed for not yielding their presence at *Idol sacrifices* on the Edicts of the Emperour. Until we know what is a *civil presence*, we must admire the largeness of your fancy, under the great strictness of your Conscience: and be sure you can foot it any way to free your self from danger; for your *necessitas officii* doth fail, when the Magistrate doth *Religiously* (in zeal, whether good or bad, I will not dispute) compel your *personal attendance* on a *Religious administration*, by you judged *cultus adulterinus*: Nor will your *necessitas beneficii* hold against that Rule, *We must not do evil that good may come thereby*: It cannot please me, that any called a *Presbyter*, should own and argue the Jesuitical partition of *body and soul*, in external communion with the Church visible, in outward

outward Ordinances ; in which, the *qualis* of my presence must be judged by its appearance *ad vulgum* to the observing world, and not by mine inward intention, and mental reservation : *Pudeat nobis hoc dici potuisse*—— Know you not, that all Protestants have abandoned, abominated, and exploded this distinction, as the odious covert of *Church-Papists*, in their Hypocritical obedience to the Statutes', which commanded their presence at Divine Service ?

Your last Quæry, concerning the Solemn League and Covenant, is by your self resolved, without any regard, or the least Answer to the three Considerations I have laid before you in my last : I will not therefore strive to word it with you to no purpose ; consider, and rationally contradict what hath been said ; otherwise, you multiply words in vain. In all you have now said on this Question, you have said no *new thing* ; therefore I will say *nothing* ; but pray that God may break the Snares with which you are entangled, and give you unfeigned Repentance.

F I N I S.